# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR · | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/699,036 | 10/31/2003 | Andrew John Bradfield | SOM920030008US1 | 1193 |

59559      7590      02/21/2008
RYAN, MASON & LEWIS, LLP
90 FOREST AVENUE
LOCUST VALLEY, NY 11560

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| ABDUL-ALI, OMAR R |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2178 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 02/21/2008 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Office Action Summary** | | 10/699,036 | BRADFIELD ET AL. |
| | | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | | Omar Abdul-Ali | 2178 |

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _30 November 2007_.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.        2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1,3-11 and 14-20_ is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1, 3-11, and 14-20_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

   1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

The following action is in response to the Appeal Brief filed November 30, 2007.

Amended Claims 1, 3-11, and 14-20 are pending and have been considered below.

1. Examiner's Note: Applicant's arguments, of the previous claim(s) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2.      The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.      Claims 1, 4-8, 17, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart et al. (US 2002/0152110) in view of the web forum topic "javascript thread: Wait until another frame is loaded?" posted March 5, 2003 available from Programmer to Programmer (hereinafter Programmer).

Claims 1, 17, and 19: Stewart discloses a method of processing information, associated with an information source, in accordance with a browser, comprising:

a. obtaining information from the information source (page 3, paragraph 40);

Stewart discloses preventing a user from interacting with a displayed first portion of the received information until after a second portion of the received information is

sufficiently loaded (page 4, paragraph 51), however <u>Stewart</u> does not explicitly disclose

said prevention occurs after a determination is made that the second portion depends

on the first portion, otherwise, permitting the user to interact with the displayed first

portion regardless of whether the second portion is sufficiently loaded. <u>Programmer</u>

discloses a technique of setting a global variable to check to see if a desired page is

fully loaded (page 1). The variable is added in the pages being loaded in order to set a

dependency between the desired page and the subsequent pages. If the variable is

present in the desired page, the page would wait for both conditions to be satisfied

before allowing the user to proceed, and if the variable is not present in the desired

page, the user would not have to wait for the subsequent frames to be fully loaded. It

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to set a variable which controls the dependency of portions of received

information in <u>Stewart</u> because setting variables determining whether or not portions of

information depend on each other was recognized as part of the ordinary capabilities of

a skilled artisan. One would have been motivated to provide these limitations in order to

prevent undesired application behavior which may be caused by a user responding too

soon to a loading page.


Claim 4: <u>Stewart</u> discloses a method of processing information, associated with an

information source, in accordance with a browser, comprising:

  a. obtaining information from the information source (page 3, paragraph 40);

Stewart discloses preventing a user from interacting with underlying graphics until they are fully loaded by overlaying a layer over the Web page that is loading the graphic, thus rendering the graphic portion inactive until it is fully loaded. Though the technique provided by Stewart does not explicitly disclose rendering a first portion inactive until the second portion is sufficiently loaded, it would have been obvious to a skilled artisan at the time the invention was made to do so. Programmer provides a technique of using global variables to make a user wait until certain conditions are met before interacting with a page. Specifically, if the 'isLoaded' variable is set to false in the loading portions, the desired page must wait until the variable is set to true before the user can proceed. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to render the first portion inactive until the second portion is sufficiently loaded in Stewart, because Stewart already provides the functionality of rendering a portion inactive until it is fully loaded. One would have been motivated to render a first portion inactive until a second portion is fully loaded in order to prevent undesired application behavior.

Claim 5: Stewart and Programmer disclose a method of processing information, associated with an information source, in accordance with a browser as in Claim 1 above, and Stewart further discloses the second portion is sufficiently loaded when it is fully loaded (page 4, paragraph 51).

Claim 6: <u>Stewart</u> and <u>Programmer</u> disclose a method of processing information,

associated with an information source, in accordance with a browser as in Claim 1

above, and <u>Stewart</u> further discloses the browser is implemented on a client computer

system (page 3, paragraph 40).

Claim 7: <u>Stewart</u> and <u>Programmer</u> disclose a method of processing information,

associated with an information source, in accordance with a browser as in Claim 1

above, and <u>Stewart</u> further discloses the browser comprises a web browser (page 3,

paragraph 40).

Claim 8: <u>Stewart</u> and <u>Programmer</u> disclose a method of processing information,

associated with an information source, in accordance with a browser as in Claim 1

above, and <u>Stewart</u> further discloses the information source comprises at least one

server computer system (page 3, paragraph 40).

4.      Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Stewart et</u>

<u>al.</u> (US 2002/0152110) in view of the web forum topic "javascript thread: Wait until

another frame is loaded?" posted March 5, 2003 available from Programmer to

Programmer (hereinafter <u>Programmer</u>) and further in view of von Kaenel et al. (US

7,107,285) (hereinafter <u>Kaenel</u>).

Claim 3: <u>Stewart</u> and <u>Programmer</u> disclose a method of processing information, associated with an information source, in accordance with a browser as in Claim 1 above, and <u>Stewart</u> further discloses overlaying a layer over the Web page that is loading the graphic, however, neither reference explicitly discloses instructing the user to wait to interact with the first portion until after the second portion is sufficiently loaded when the determination is made that the second portion depends on the first portion. <u>Kaenel</u> discloses a similar method of processing information associated with an information source that further discloses instructing a user to wait for a requested map to load before beginning another task (column 94, lines 57-67). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a message on the overlay in <u>Stewart</u> instructing the user to wait to interact with the first portion until the second portion of the page is sufficiently loaded. One would have been motivated to include a message instructing a user to wait in order to prevent a user form answering a survey question before viewing the graphic on the page.

5.    Claims 9-11, 14-16, 18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Mikhailov et al.</u> (US 2003/0018714) in view of the web forum topic "javascript thread: Wait until another frame is loaded?" posted March 5, 2003 available from Programmer to Programmer (hereinafter <u>Programmer</u>).

Claims 9, 18, and 20: Mikhailov discloses a system for making a web browser act like a stand-alone application, comprising:

a. obtaining information from the information source in accordance with an application, wherein the application comprises at least one subapplication [second frame] (page 3, paragraph 17).

b. upon a request made to the subapplication, determining whether a current page of the application is loaded (page 2, paragraph 17). By linking to the second site, or subapplication the first displayed frame is deactivated, implying that it had been determined that the current page is loaded.

Mikhailov discloses preserving data associated with the current page before loading the subapplication (page 3, paragraph 17-18), however, Mikhailov does not explicitly disclose preserving the data then the page is fully loaded. Programmer discloses a technique of setting a global variable to check to see if a desired page is fully loaded (page 1). The variable is added in the pages being loaded in order to set a dependency between the desired page and the subsequent pages. If the variable is present in the desired page, the page would wait for both conditions to be satisfied before allowing the user to proceed, and if the variable is not present in the desired page, the user would not have to wait for the subsequent frames to be fully loaded. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make a determination of whether a page is fully loaded in Mikhailov. One would have been motivated to determine if a page is fully loaded when preserving data in order to save the state of an application for future navigation back to the content.

Mikhailov does not explicitly disclose when the current page is not fully loaded, loading the subapplication without preserving data associated with the current page.

However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to refrain from preserving data of a current page when linking to

another site. Programmer discloses using global variables in pages to set conditions of

whether or not a user must wait on a page to be fully loaded before proceeding (page

1). It would have been obvious to set the onLoad variable to a value that would allow

the user to navigate to the subapplication without having to wait on content that is

currently loading. One would have been motivated to load the subapplication without

preserving data associated with the current page to improve computer efficiency.

Loading both pages simultaneously would reduce processing speed, so it would be

advantageous to load the second page without preserving the data from the first frame.


Claim 11: Mikhailov and Programmer disclose a system for making a web browser act

like a stand-alone application as in Claim 9 above, and Mikhailov further discloses:

   a. retrieving the preserved data when the user returns from the subapplication

(page 3, paragraph 18).


Claim 14: Mikhailov and Programmer disclose a system for making a web browser act

like a stand-alone application as in Claim 9 above, and Mikhailov further discloses:

   a. the browser is implemented on a client computer system (page 11, paragraph

145).

Claim 15: Mikhailov and Programmer disclose a system for making a web browser act

like a stand-alone application as in Claim 9 above, and Mikhailov further discloses:

   a. the browser comprises a web browser (page 11, paragraph 145).


Claim 16: Mikhailov and Programmer disclose a system for making a web browser act

like a stand-alone application as in Claim 9 above, and Mikhailov further discloses:

   a. the information source comprises at least one server computer system (page

11, paragraph 146).


6.     Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Mikhailov et al. (US 2003/0018714) in view of the web forum topic "javascript thread:

Wait until another frame is loaded?" posted March 5, 2003 available from Programmer

to Programmer (hereinafter Programmer) and further in view of Stewart et al. (US

2002/0152110).


Claim 10: Mikhailov and Programmer disclose a system for making a web browser act

like a stand-alone application as in Claim 9 above, but neither reference explicitly

discloses storing user provided data in a hidden frame. Stewart discloses a similar

method, apparatus, and program for making a web browser act like a stand-alone

application that further discloses storing and maintaining data in a hidden frame (page

3, paragraph 46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to store the data in a hidden frame. One

would have been motivated to store the data in a hidden frame to maintain entered data while the frame is hidden from view.

### *Response to Arguments*

7.    Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-11, and 14-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Omar Abdul-Ali whose telephone number is 571-270-1694. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri(Alternate Fridays Off) 8:30 - 6:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system.  Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

OAA
2/19/2008

STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER